

From: justin.wojdacki@analog.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/26/02 3:51pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Some points that I feel are important (I am not a lawyer. I am speaking based on what I have read of other peoples' interpretations of the proposed final judgement):

"Windows Operating System" should be defined to be any Microsoft product implementing any subset of the Win32 APIs. This is important as Microsoft is diversifying their operating system product lines beyond their traditional desktop and server markets. Therefore, the definition of "Windows Operating System" should include any and all platforms that the Win32 APIs are available on now and in the future.

The complete Win32 API must be made available. This should include alternate entry points to functions (if they exist). An independent team should review the Windows source code to verify correspondence between the published API documentation and the implementation. Microsoft should not be allowed to add APIs until this process is complete. It would additionally be desirable, although likely unimplementable, to have a 3rd party responsible for defining the Win32 API. This would be akin to the POSIX and SUS (Single Unix Standard) definitions, where a committee defines the API, and developers are free to implement it themselves. Developers may propose extensions to these APIs, but they are not standards unless the committees accept them. Additionally, the final judgment should cover any APIs that Microsoft adds after acceptance of said judgment. Otherwise, third party developers may find themselves at a competitive disadvantage again. No APIs should be withheld from public documentation under any circumstances. No conditions should be placed on the release of any of this API documentation. All intellectual property issues related to any part of any API should be made public as part of that API's documentation.

Microsoft's applications developers (Internet Explorer, Office, etc.) should receive the same information as third party software developers. Additionally, they should receive it at the same time as third party software developers. Should they receive this information early, or receive more detailed information, they then hold an unfair competitive advantage in the software market. Additionally, they should be required to go through the same support channels as third party software developers, lest they potentially receive preferential treatment.

--

Justin Wojdacki
justin.wojdacki@analog.com (408) 350-5032
Communications Processors Group -- Analog Devices